

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

JAMES D. GRIEPSMA,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHRISTIAN J. ANDERSON, et al.,

Defendant.

Case No. C19-181-RSM-MLP

ORDER

Currently before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (dkt. # 80) ("Plaintiff's Motion") of this Court's Order regarding Plaintiff's previously pending motions and Defendants' Motion for a New Deadline to File a Reply to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (dkt. # 76).¹ Plaintiff requests the Court to reconsider its ruling regarding Plaintiff's "Notice to Defendants for Constitutional Challenge to Motion for Summary Judgment" ("Plaintiff's Notice"). (Dkt. # 68.) This Court previously denied and struck Plaintiff's Notice

¹ This matter was referred back to the Court on June 3, 2020, after this Court submitted a Report and Recommendation on May 6, 2020, to the Honorable Ricardo S. Martinez regarding Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. (Dkt. ## 66, 74). Several of Plaintiff's filings, including Plaintiff's "Notice to Defendants for Constitutional Challenge to Motion for Summary Judgment" (dkt. # 68), were received by the Court via email between April 23 and April 24, 2020, but not filed until May 12, 2020, due to an issue with the Court's Prisoner Electronic Filing Procedures. (Dkt. # 74.) This matter was referred back to the Court for consideration of the additional documents in its forthcoming Report and Recommendation. (*Id.*)

1 because it failed to seek relief, and instead, listed questions and arguments that were duplicative
2 of arguments previously addressed in Plaintiff's Response to Defendants' Motion for Summary
3 Judgment ("Plaintiff's Response"). (Pl.'s Resp. (Dkt. # 71) at 2-3; Dkt. # 76.)

4 Motions for reconsideration are disfavored in this district and will be granted only upon a
5 "showing of manifest error in the prior ruling" or "new facts or legal authority which could not
6 have been brought to [the Court's] attention earlier without reasonable diligence." LCR 7(h)(1).
7 Here, Plaintiff has not shown a manifest error in the Court's prior ruling, nor has he presented
8 new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to the Court's attention earlier
9 through reasonable diligence. Additionally, the arguments presented in Plaintiff's Motion were
10 previously brought to the Court's attention in his prior pleadings. (*Compare* Pl.'s Notice (Dkt.
11 # 68) at 2-3 *and* Pl.'s Resp., at 2-3 *with* Pl.'s Mot. (Dkt. # 80) at 4-5.) Therefore, Plaintiff has not
12 made either of the showings required by Local Rule 7(h)(1), and accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion
13 (dkt. # 80) is DENIED.

14 The Clerk is directed to send copies of this order to the parties and to the Honorable
15 Ricardo S. Martinez.

16 Dated this 30th day of June, 2020.

17 

18 MICHELLE L. PETERSON
19 United States Magistrate Judge
20
21
22
23